



Chief Justice Christine C. Durham  
Chairperson, Utah Judicial Council

September 30, 2009

Daniel J. Becker  
State Court Administrator  
Myron K. March  
Deputy Court Administrator

Senator Allen M. Christensen, Chair  
Child Welfare Legislative Oversight Panel  
Utah State Senate Office  
W115 State Capitol Complex  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

Representative Merlynn T. Newbold, Chair  
Child Welfare Legislative Oversight Panel  
Utah House of Representatives Office  
W30 State Capitol Complex  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

Dear Senator Christensen and Representative Newbold:

The Juvenile Court submits this report on the timely occurrence of child welfare proceedings and the reasons for delay pursuant to Utah Code Ann. § 62A-4a-207 (2001). The Courts are pleased to report continued strength in compliance with the majority of performance measures listed in statute. We appreciated this opportunity to share information with the Panel and look forward to continued dialogue in the future.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ray Wahl".

Ray Wahl  
Juvenile Court Administrator

cc: Mark Andrews w/encl.

The mission of the Utah judiciary is to provide the people an open, fair,  
efficient, and independent system for the advancement of justice under the law.

450 South State Street / P.O. Box 140241 / Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-0241 / 801-578-3800 / Fax: 801-578-3843

# **Child Welfare Statutory Time Requirements Report**

September 30, 2009

Administrative Office of the Courts  
P. O. Box 140241  
450 South State Street  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-0241  
(801) 578-3800

## I. Timely Permanency for Children and Families

As provided by Utah Code Ann. § 62A-4a-207 (2001), the Utah State Courts submit its annual report to the Child Welfare Legislative Oversight Panel on the judicial processing of child welfare cases.

Utah's child protection legislation (Utah Code Ann. § 78A-6-101 et seq.) is designed to achieve timely permanency for children and to protect the rights of all parties in the courtroom. Utah Code Ann. § 78A-6-314 requires that efforts be made to place a child in a safe, permanent home in no less than twelve months when a child must be removed from the home. Towards this ultimate goal, the Child Welfare Act poses timelines for significant events in child welfare cases, such as pretrial and adjudication hearings;<sup>1</sup> dispositional hearings and reunification services;<sup>2</sup> and permanency hearings and petitions for termination.<sup>3</sup> The statute makes clear that adherence to these significant events is the responsibility of all system participants, not the least of which is the judiciary. Utah's Juvenile Court has maintained its focus on compliance with statutory timelines and continues to produce consistent results from year to year in the categories monitored by statute.

Over the years, additional statutory requirements have required added hearing time and other judicial resources. Examples include statutory requirements for pre-removal hearings and expedited timelines associated with hearing Protective Service Supervision cases. Beginning May 1, 2006, new statutory provisions provided for a hearing prior to removal of a child in certain situations. By statute, these hearings require notice to parents and must be held within 72 hours of the filing of a Motion for Expedited Placement in Temporary Custody. While the hearings require additional court resources, they replace requests for warrants or removals without a warrant where appropriate. The Juvenile Court also continues to receive a substantial number of filings seeking Protective Services Supervision ("PSS"). In PSS cases, families receive court-ordered services from the Division of Child and Family Services while the children remain in their homes or the home of a relative. PSS filings require expedited treatment following legislation which became effective in May 2003. PSS cases must be set for pretrial in 15 days and for an adjudication trial in 60 days. In some districts, attorneys filing petitions seeking PSS services are requesting expedited hearings at the earliest possible date, rather than waiting to schedule a pretrial hearing within 15 days.

## II. Data

The data in this report consists of all new cases that entered the court system via a shelter hearing between October 1, 2008 and September 28, 2009 (*see* Juvenile Child Welfare Time Standards

---

<sup>1</sup> Utah Code Ann. § 78A-6-309

<sup>2</sup> Utah Code Ann. § 78A-6-312

<sup>3</sup> Utah Code Ann. § 78A-6-314

Report, attached). Included in this report are any cases that were previously active cases at some stage of the proceedings and had a subsequent hearing during that time frame. Although not required by statute, the court also reports on cases which enter the court system via the filing of a PSS petition as defined above.

These percentages demonstrate that court events in most child welfare cases occur in the expedited fashion contemplated by the statute. Please note that not all of the timelines for all events have lapsed in a one year snapshot. Some cases may have just been entered as of September 28, 2009, the last reporting day. This report does not track individual cases from start to finish, but rather reports on all court events scheduled within a one-year time frame.

#### Pretrial and Adjudication Hearings (78A-6-309)

- (1) Upon the filing of a petition, the clerk of the court shall set the pretrial hearing on the petition within 15 calendar days from the later of: (a) the date of the shelter hearing; or (b) the filing of the petition.*
- (2) The pretrial may be continued upon motion of any party, for good cause shown, but the final adjudication hearing shall be held no later than 60 calendar days from the later of: (a) the date of the shelter hearing; or (b) the filing of the petition.*

The Child Welfare Act provides that pretrial hearings take place within 15 days of the shelter hearing, though a continuance may be granted for good cause shown. Of 1141 pretrial hearings, 91% occurred within 15 days, and 99% of the cases were compliant within an additional 15 days.

Adjudication of the petition must take place within 60 days of the shelter hearing. Of 798 adjudication hearings, 95% were held within the required time frame and 99% of the cases were compliant within an additional 15 days.

#### Dispositional Hearings and Reunification Services (78A-6-311, 312)

Pursuant to 78A-6-311(2) a dispositional hearing *"shall be held no later than 30 calendar days after the date of the adjudication hearing."* In most cases, dispositional orders are entered at the adjudication hearing. Of 858 dispositional hearings, 87% occurred within the 30 day requirement. Although this percentage reflects a 4% point decrease from last year's report, 96% of the cases have achieved disposition within an additional 15 day time frame.

***78A-6-312 (2) (f) (iii) If reunification services are not been ordered, a permanency hearing shall be conducted within 30 days, in accordance with Section 78A-6-314.***

Of the 71 no reunification to permanency proceedings conducted by the court, 77% were held within 30 days of the no reunification decision. This represents a 12% increase over last year. The 16 cases that were not compliant included a large sibling group in which the court required additional time to establish the paternity of multiple fathers. Two additional cases were delayed

because counsel could not attend a scheduled hearing. A frequent reason for delay is that a decision was made to extend reunification services to only one parent. For example, a decision could be made not to extend reunification services to a father who was adjudicated as severely abusive or had abandoned the child. The mother, however, was appropriate to receive court-ordered services toward reunification and was given the full statutory period to work toward reunification. In these cases, the permanency hearing was extended beyond the 30 day period to afford the mother a full opportunity for reunification.

#### Permanency Hearings and Petitions for Termination (78A-6-314)

*(1) (a) When reunification services have been ordered in accordance with Section 78A-6-312, with regard to a child who is in the custody of the Division of Child and Family Services, a permanency hearing shall be held by the court no later than 12 months after the original removal of the child.*

Utah's child protection legislation imposes two standards for permanency: one for children over 36 months of age, and a shorter time frame for children 36 months or younger, to promote expedited permanency for children in the formative stages.

Of the 429 children over 36 months of age, 87% had a permanency hearing within twelve months of removal. A permanency hearing was held in 93% of the cases within an additional 30 days.

Of the 231 children under 36 months of age, 79% had permanency hearings within 8 months of removal. A permanency hearing was held in 92% of the cases within an additional 30 days.

*(5) If the final plan for the minor is to proceed toward termination of parental rights, the petition for termination of parental rights shall be filed, and a pretrial held, within 45 calendar days after the permanency hearing.*

The courts rely on counsel for the timely filing of petitions for termination, although the courts have a duty to supervise proceedings in their courtroom. In 173 proceedings, a petition was filed to terminate parental rights. Fifty-five percent of petitions were filed and a pre-trial scheduled within 45 calendar days. This reflects a 13% percentage point increase from last year.

Timeliness in this measure continues to be an area of concern and focus for the judiciary and other stakeholders. Delay in this area may be attributed both to the timeliness of counsels' ability to file the petition, as well as the court's calendar. It may also be due to a general reluctance to petition for termination of parental rights if a child is not already placed in a home likely to result in adoption. In some cases in which a petition is not immediately filed, the court calendars a review for 45 days after the permanency hearing instead of a pre-trial. While the petition is ultimately filed and the hearing type recorded as a pre-trial, this data entry may not be reflected on the tracking report. This is a data quality issue on which the courts will continue to educate personnel.

*(8)(c) A decision on the petition for termination of parental rights shall be made within 18 months from the day on which the minor is removed from the*

*minor's home.*

Of the 167 termination proceedings heard by the court, 89% met the statutory requirement, a two percentage point improvement over last year. Timeliness in this area is also reliant on both the court and counsel. After the court renders a decision, the court requires the prevailing party to submit a proposed order to the court for signature. In some cases, submission of the written order was the cause for delay. In other cases, delay is caused by the court's calendar and the ability to schedule a trial on the termination petition.

#### Protective Services Supervision Petitions ("PSS") 78A-6-309

- (1) Upon the filing of a petition, the clerk of the court shall set the pretrial hearing on the petition within 15 calendar days from the later of: (a) the date of the shelter hearing; or (b) the filing of the petition.*
- (2) The pretrial may be continued upon motion of any party, for good cause shown, but the final adjudication hearing shall be held no later than 60 calendar days from the later of: (a) the date of the shelter hearing; or (b) the filing of the petition.*

The statutory guidelines do not require the judiciary to report information regarding the timeliness of PSS cases. However, due to the dramatic growth in PSS petition filings, this information has been included in this report beginning in 2004. During the current reporting period, 1420 PSS petitions were filed compared to just 578 in 2003. Of the 1420 PSS petitions filed, pre-trial hearings were held within 15 days of filing in 98% of the cases, which reflects a four percentage point increase over last year. Pre-trial hearings were held in 100% of the cases within an additional 15 days (30 days from filing of the petition).

During the current reporting period, 921 PSS cases were tracked from filing to adjudication, compared to 363 cases in 2003. Of the 921 cases reported, 98% received the required adjudication hearing within 60 days.

### III. Reasons for Delay

The Juvenile Court continues to refine methods for tracking case loads and reasons for delay. One of the most common reasons for delay continues to be overloaded court dockets. The Court has experienced a trend toward growth in scheduling related delays in the past four years. In 2005, only 26% of the cases experiencing a delay were attributable to the Court calendar. This number grew to 37% in 2008 and 47% in 2009. While child welfare cases currently make up only about 10% of the cases referred to juvenile court, they require 50% of the judges' time.

About one third of all child welfare case delays are attributable to categories associated with counsel and parties. These categories are as follows: Motion to Continue Filed (8%), Mediation (7%), Counsel Unavailable (6%), Unable to Locate Party (4%), Unable to Serve Party (2%), Counsel or Party Failed to Appear (2%), and Change of Counsel (1%).

In 24% of the cases tracked, "Other" was selected as a reason for delay. As demonstrated by the attached detail sheet for "Other" reasons for delay, a variety of scenarios are involved. These must, at times, be handled on a case by case basis. Reasons in the "Other" category are as diverse as the need to locate one of the parents (typically the father), allowing time to properly comply with requirements of the Indian Child Welfare Act ("ICWA") and tribal notification, the need for case transfers between districts, or because all parties agree that a continuation is necessary under the unique circumstances of a case. In some cases additional time is given to a parent who is successfully working toward reunification, and in other cases, a parent later relinquishes parental rights unexpectedly.

#### IV. Strategies to Track and Reduce Delay

Utah's Juvenile Court has maintained its focus on compliance with statutory timeframes and delay reduction. The eight judicial districts continue to work on delay-reduction strategies put into place in 2002-2003. Stakeholders continue to meet periodically to improve communication, to evaluate progress, and to refine strategies.

Delay Reduction Teams created in each district are known as the "Tables of 6" or "Local Tables." The district teams receive guidance and support from the statewide "Table of 6." Each judicial district formed statewide teams comprised of, at a minimum, a judge, court personnel, an Assistant Attorney General, defense attorneys, a Guardian ad litem, and a DCFS staff representative. This model has allowed information and quality improvement efforts to travel up and down the chain of command through the state. Approximately every other year, Utah's Court Improvement Program (CIP) hosts a Summit to provide training and encourage collaboration and the sharing of ideas between district teams. The CIP is a federally funded grant program designed to encourage states to make improvements in child welfare practice.

In November, 2005, the Juvenile Court launched a new Juvenile Management Information System. The Courts and Agencies Records Exchange (CARE) provides for improved availability of and access to delinquency and child welfare information. The Courts' CARE User Group continues to refine and enhance the CARE system and build additional management reports. Currently, court staff is working on enhancements to automate the collection of information on compliance with time standards outlined in this report. At the present time, data is collected manually by court clerks, an undertaking which represents substantial time and effort. Recognizing the benefit that this information has provided the Courts, the Courts look forward to automating this process through the CARE system. A subcommittee on the collection of child welfare time standards data met regularly throughout 2008 and made significant progress toward setting parameters for automated case tracking. Currently, extensive programming of the rules designed by the subcommittee is occurring, and initial test phases may begin as early as the fall of 2009.

#### V. Conclusions

The Juvenile Court is committed to continued assessment of court practices and achieved outcomes. The judiciary does not act alone in ensuring timely permanency for children and

continues its commitments and efforts to work together with the many stakeholders who share this responsibility.

The Judiciary thanks the Panel for this opportunity to report and share information on the efforts of Utah's Juvenile Court to ensure timely permanency for children. As always, legislative representatives are welcome to observe dependency proceedings to gain a better understanding of the child welfare process. The Juvenile Court encourages all legislators to take advantage of this opportunity to observe juvenile court practice first hand. Ray Wahl, Juvenile Court Administrator, or Katie Gregory, Assistant Juvenile Court Administrator are happy to facilitate such attendance and to supply any additional information that the Panel may require.



## Juvenile Child Welfare Time Standards Reports

[Juvenile Child Welfare Time Standards Reports](#) | [Statewide Summary Report](#) | [Reason Summary](#) | [Detailed Reason Summary](#) | [Log Off](#).

Choose Judicial District

- All -

Start Month: 10    Start Year: 2008

End Month: 9    End Year: 2009

[Go](#)

### Compliance Summary for all Judicial Districts

fact	compliance	case count	compliant	non-compliant	percent compliant	within 3 days	within 15 days	within 30 days
'removal' to 'notice to parties'	1 days	610	602	8	99%	100%	100%	100%
'removal' to 'shelter hearing'	3 days	1192	1098	94	92%	99%	100%	100%
'shelter hearing' to 'shelter hearing cont.'	5 days	161	141	20	88%	89%	95%	96%
'shelter hearing' to 'pretrial'	15 days	1141	1040	101	91%	92%	99%	99%
'shelter hearing' to 'pretrial cont.'	60 days	644	554	90	86%	87%	90%	91%
'shelter hearing' to 'adjudication'	60 days	798	762	36	95%	97%	99%	99%
'adjudication' to 'disposition'	30 days	858	750	108	87%	89%	96%	97%
'no reunification' to 'permanency hearing'	30 days	71	55	16	77%	77%	82%	90%
'removal' to 'permanency hearing'	12 months	429	374	55	87%	88%	92%	93%
'removal' to 'permanency hearing' children	8 months	231	182	49	79%	81%	89%	92%

younger than 36 months								
'permanency hearing' to 'termination pretrial'	45 days	173	95	78	55%	55%	61%	65%
'removal' to 'decision on petition to terminate'	18 months	167	148	19	89%	89%	89%	90%
'removal' to 'six month review'	6 months	498	464	34	93%	94%	95%	96%
'PSS petition filing' to 'pre- trial'	15 days	1420	1386	34	98%	99%	100%	100%
'PSS petition filing' to 'adjudication'	60 days	921	901	20	98%	98%	99%	99%

Please submit questions or comments about this site to: [info@email.utcourts.gov](mailto:info@email.utcourts.gov)

## Juvenile Child Welfare Time Standards Reports

[Juvenile Child Welfare Time Standards Reports](#) | [Statewide Summary Report](#) | [Reason Summary](#) | [Detailed Reason Summary](#) | [Log Off](#)

Choose Judicial District

- All -

Start Month: 10 Start Year: 2008

End Month: 9 End Year: 2009

Go

723 reasons have been entered. There are still 39 that haven't been entered.

### Reason Summary for all Judicial Districts

reason	count	Percentage
Court Calendar	<u>338</u>	47%
Motion to Continue, Filed By:	<u>60</u>	8%
Witness Unavailable	<u>1</u>	0%
Counsel Unavailable	<u>42</u>	6%
Change of Counsel	<u>4</u>	1%
Unable to Serve Party	<u>15</u>	2%
Unable to Locate Party	<u>26</u>	4%
Counsel or Party Failed to Appear	<u>11</u>	2%
Mediation	<u>51</u>	7%
Other	<u>175</u>	24%

Please submit questions or comments about this site to: [info@email.utcourts.gov](mailto:info@email.utcourts.gov)

## Juvenile Child Welfare Time Standards Reports

[Juvenile Child Welfare Time Standards Reports](#) | [Statewide Summary Report](#) | [Reason Summary](#) | [Detailed Reason Summary](#) | [Log Off](#)

Case Number	Reason	Note
1000116	Other	Pretrial on incident 2 held w/i time frame. Incident 3 shows 12/10/2008 for petition filed initially on 11/13/2008 so this meets timeframe as well.
<u>1000117</u>	Other	Holiday and counsel & court unavailable
<u>1000662</u>	Other	parties concurred
<u>1000706</u>	Other	Motion for Findings filed against father. Mediation and Pretrial on Motion scheduled.
<u>1000927</u>	Other	father's hearing was set over
<u>1001246</u>	Other	Mother filed a voluntary relinquishment petition, but was denied by the judge. Mediation dates set.
<u>1001912</u>	Other	parties concurred on hearing date
<u>1001917</u>	Other	On 2/19/09 permanency was extended to 6/11/09. At the 6/11/09 hearing, the State informed the Court that it will file a petition to terminate parental rights
<u>1002154</u>	Other	Petition not filed by AG office until June 25, 2009.
<u>1002910</u>	Other	Needed more discovery
1003161	Other	permanency cont. 90 days
1003593	Other	Went to trial
1003594	Other	trial
<u>1003595</u>	Other	trial
<u>1004245</u>	Other	scheduled by AG's office
<u>1004874</u>	Other	Other children had to be removed from the home.
<u>1004886</u>	Other	Case has had multiple pre-trial and trial dates. Has been reviewed every couple of months. All parties have agreed to these dates in Court.
1004887	Other	Case has had multiple pre-trial and trial dates. Has been reviewed every couple of months. All parties agreed to these dates set in Court.
<u>1005113</u>	Other	Calender

1005357	Other	Reunification was terminated at a review and none of the parties motioned to move the permanency up.
<u>1005357</u>	Other	on 10-21-08, the mother requested court appointed counsel and was transferred from Judge <del>1</del> to Judge <u>2</u> ext hearing was on 11-26-08 with Judge <u>2</u> .
<u>1005915</u>	Other	multiple pre-trial hearings put this case out of compliance.
<u>1005974</u>	Other	all parties stipulated to going past the timeline
1005977	Other	all parties stipulated to going past the time line
<u>1005979</u>	Other	all parties stipulated to going past the timeline
<u>1006688</u>	Other	Due to this case having multiple hearings, this case is out of compliance.
<u>1006706</u>	Other	date requested by the state
<u>1006707</u>	Other	the date the attys requested.
<u>1006769</u>	Other	date attys requested
1006914	Other	private petition
1007152	Other	Child was not part of the original petition. Was added by stipulation at mediation and pretrial held on 10/08/08.
<u>1007873</u>	Other	ag
<u>1008722</u>	Other	We aren't out of compliance because the 30th day fell on a Saturday and the disposition hearing took place the next business day.
<u>1008723</u>	Other	we aren't out of compliance --- the 30th day fell on a Saturday and the disposition hearing took place on the next business day
1008724	Other	we aren't out of compliance --- the 30th day fell on a Saturday and the disposition hearing took place on the first business day thereafter
<u>1009560</u>	Other	Resolution was not reached within 60 days.
<u>1009561</u>	Other	father unwilling to reach agreement. parties attempted mediation to avoid trial.
<u>1010340</u>	Other	Due to Mental Health the mother and father voluntarily placed the child with DCFS
<u>1012018</u>	Other	all parties concurred
1012018	Other	parties concurred
1012021	Other	all parties concurred
<u>1012021</u>	Other	parties concurred

<u>1012025</u>	Other	all parties concurred
<u>1012025</u>	Other	parties concurred
<u>1012566</u>	Other	parties concurred
<u>1012566</u>	Other	parties concurred on date
1012566	Other	parties stipulated
1012673	Other	all parties concurred
1012964	Other	Needed time to determine paternity of fathers of all of the children
<u>1012966</u>	Other	Needed time to determine paternity on all fathers of all the children.
<u>1012967</u>	Other	Needed time to determine paternity on all children
<u>1013704</u>	Other	all parties concurred
<u>1013704</u>	Other	parties concurred
1016685	Other	Due to scheduling and court calendar.
1016940	Other	Public Defender requested. Parties stipulated to continuance past 5 days.
<u>1016941</u>	Other	Public defender requested. Parties stipulated to continuance more than 5 days.
<u>1017144</u>	Other	AG
<u>1017145</u>	Other	AG
<u>1017399</u>	Other	Upon stipulation of parties based upon the mother's incarceration and immigration issues.
1017400	Other	Upon stipulation of parties based upon the mother's incarceration.
1017514	Other	Stipulation of parties based upon mother's incarceration.
<u>1017515</u>	Other	Upon stipulation of parties based upon mother's incarceration
<u>1017517</u>	Other	Upon stipulation of parties based upon the mother's incarceration.
<u>1018566</u>	Other	parties concurred
<u>1018570</u>	Other	parties concurred
1018572	Other	parties concurred
1018573	Other	parties concurred
1019829	Other	Parties concurred.
<u>1019830</u>	Other	parties concurred
<u>1019831</u>	Other	parties concurred

<u>1021294</u>	Other	Originally came in as PSS, Judge issued a warrant for removal, is now shelter. PSS petition will be dismissed
<u>106769</u>	Other	attys requested the dates
<u>154101</u>	Other	parties concurred
<u>170041</u>	Other	when parties requested it
<u>170044</u>	Other	when parties requested it
<u>170045</u>	Other	when parties requested
<u>429437</u>	Other	Need to determine paternity on all father of the all the children
<u>429444</u>	Other	so many fathers and paternity needed to established for each child.
<u>435408</u>	Other	
<u>442917</u>	Other	this was a review on Mother and Father.
<u>461607</u>	Other	numerous petitions files, tpr was going to happen and then didn't, mediation occurred and a guardian was assigned.
<u>465054</u>	Other	AG
<u>465901</u>	Other	Child was not part of the original petition. Was added by stipulation at mediation and pretrial held on 10/08/08.
<u>474237</u>	Other	Trial was set but a resolution was reached.
<u>500612</u>	Other	ag did not notify the Courts until 8/18/09
<u>501229</u>	Other	Child has been in treatment in SLC with severe psychological disorders and case has been complicated by that. Nothing filed by AG's office.
<u>501342</u>	Other	Trial was set was set but a resolution was reached.
<u>502621</u>	Other	Shelter Hearing continued as per independent rights of the Paiute Indian Tribe.
<u>502630</u>	Other	Shelter Hearing continued as per independent rights of the Paiute Indian Tribe.
<u>503458</u>	Other	we aren't out of compliance --- the 30th day fell on a Saturday and the disposition hearing took place on the first business day thereafter
<u>513258</u>	Other	
<u>514930</u>	Other	
<u>516212</u>	Other	all parties concurred
<u>519406</u>	Other	Parents signed the Petition to Voluntary

Relinquishment of Parental Rights on  
03/11/2009

<u>519406</u>	Other	it changed and child was removed again - new timeline
<u>519407</u>	Other	The Petition for Voluntary Termination of Parental Rights signed on 03/05/2009
519407	Other	the goal was changed and it created new timeline dates
<u>519544</u>	Other	Waiting for ICWA response
<u>519547</u>	Other	Waiting for ICWA response
<u>519549</u>	Other	Waiting for ICWA response to transfer case.
<u>520931</u>	Other	Permanency was extended
<u>521633</u>	Other	could not locate the father; once found, he req CONTINUANCE
524585	Other	parents had the first pt on trmpaz contd.
524633	Other	.
525503	Other	ag
<u>527340</u>	Other	Attorney General's office didn't file petition timely.
<u>527340</u>	Other	Child was removed. Mother retained custody in June 2008. Child was removed again July 2008.
<u>527342</u>	Other	Attorney General's office didn't file Petition.
<u>527342</u>	Other	Child was removed. Mother had custody returned in June 2008. Child was removed again in July 2008.
528868	Other	Case bifurcated. Not non-compliant
<u>529407</u>	Other	Due to scheduling and court calendar
<u>530616</u>	Other	Verified Petition for custody was filed on 05-12-2008
<u>530730</u>	Other	Extended date due to time needed to serve the mother via publication.
<u>530730</u>	Other	pet to terminate wasn't filed until November of 2008.
531388	Other	Needed more discovery
533358	Other	Petition was not filed by AG until June 25, 2009.
<u>533724</u>	Other	Petition not filed by AG office until June 25, 2009
<u>533856</u>	Other	All parties agreed to these dates set in Court. Continued permanency, evidentiary hearing



and then termination pre-trials

534301	Other	Request was made per AG's office to have hearing. parental rights were terminated on both parents.
536011	Other	AG did not file petition until May 19, 2009
536011	Other	Mr. (father) asked for more time to review the petition.
536124	Other	default on mother. 8/20 hrg had already been set.
536893	Other	all parties concurred
537015	Other	a second petition filed after child was picked up and placed in shelter
538508	Other	parties concurred with continuance.
543448	Other	Permanency was extended 90 days as the mother had made substantial efforts in compliance with the service plan. Mother did not complete all obligations to have the children returned at the 90 day permanency hearing.
543449	Other	Permanency was extended 90 days as the mother had made substantial efforts in compliance with the service plan. Mother did not complete all obligations to have the children returned at the 90 day permanency hearing.
544448	Other	Parties agreed on date
545345	Other	motion to set aside permanency findings, as to mother, was heard on 07-02-09. Motion was granted. Evidentiary hearing requested. State filed termination petition July 1, 2009. Evidentiary hearing and termination trial will be combined.
545432	Other	GAL, submitted a motion to scheduled the perm hearing.
545434	Other	GAL, submitted a motion to schedule a perm hearing.
545435	Other	GAL, submitted a motion to schedule a perm hearing.
545438	Other	MOTION WAS SUBMITTED BY <u>GAL</u> TO SCHEDULE PERM HEARING.
545441	Other	<u>GAL</u> . submitted a motion to schedule a perm hearing.
545782	Other	Pretrial on Father
545839	Other	Mother not in compliance with service plan and requested earlier Permanency for her child's sake.

<u>546059</u>	Other	Pretrial Motion was submitted
<u>546061</u>	Other	Father lives in Florida. This was the earliest possible hearing date with all the conflicting schedules.
<u>546216</u>	Other	Trial on permanency 3/3/09 - termination pretrial 4/1/09. Actual permanency date is 3/3/09
546497	Other	1
<u>546598</u>	Other	waiting for AG to submit PD petition.
<u>546602</u>	Other	waiting on AG to file PD petition.
<u>546779</u>	Other	ag
<u>547610</u>	Other	parties concurred
<u>547643</u>	Other	Pretrial on Father's Petition for Custody
<u>548042</u>	Other	two removals
<u>548102</u>	Other	child was returned to mother at mediation
548103	Other	child was returned at the shelter hearing
548129	Other	other
<u>548599</u>	Other	parties agreed upon date
<u>549210</u>	Other	na
<u>549403</u>	Other	a second petition filed after child was picked up and placed in shelter
<u>549404</u>	Other	a second petition filed after child was picked up and placed in shelter
550005	Other	ag
825105	Other	..
<u>885377</u>	Other	set at same time as pretrial
<u>905973</u>	Other	PV review set and agreed upon in court by Judge and AG.
<u>983013</u>	Other	parties concurred
<u>991736</u>	Other	Petition and Motion for Protective Custody filed on 5/6/09. Initial clerk responsible for calendaring this case set it 15 days later, thinking it was a PSS petition. Children were removed at the 5/21/09 pretrial and Motion hearing.
991737	Other	Petition and Motion for Protective Custody filed on 5/6/09. Initial clerk responsible for calendaring this case set it 15 days later, thinking it was a PSS petition. Children were removed at the 5/21/09 pretrial and Motion hearing.